

REMARKS

Further and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

PTO/SB/08 Form

Although the Wong et al. (US 2001/0018197) and Saito et al. (US 7,465,470) references are relied upon in the outstanding Office Action, neither reference is of record in the application. In order to ensure that the references are listed on the face of a patent resulting from the present application, Applicants enclose herewith a PTO/SB/08 Form listing these references. Applicants kindly request that the Examiner initial the form and forward an initialed-copy to Applicants' representative with the next correspondence.

Claim Amendments

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 6, as a result of which claim 6 has been cancelled, without prejudice or disclaimer.

Patentability Arguments

The patentability of the present invention over the disclosures of the references relied upon by the Examiner in rejecting the claims will be apparent upon consideration of the following remarks.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1 and 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hunter (U.S. 3,749,588) in view of Wong et al. (US 2001/0018197).

This rejection is rendered moot by the above-discussed claim amendments. Specifically, the limitations of claim 6, which is not included in the above-rejection, have been incorporated into independent claim 1. Thus, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Double Patenting Rejection

Claims 1 and 3-6 are rejected on the ground of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 7,465,470.

Applicants submit herewith a Terminal Disclaimer, together with the required fee. The Terminal Disclaimer is submitted for the sole purpose of expediting prosecution, and does not represent acquiescence to the rejection.

In view of the Terminal Disclaimer, it is respectfully requested that the above-rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Therefore, in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is submitted that each of the grounds of rejection set forth by the Examiner has been overcome, and that the application is in condition for allowance. Such allowance is solicited.

If, after reviewing this Amendment, the Examiner feels there are any issues remaining which must be resolved before the application can be passed to issue, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone in order to resolve such issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Kyoko ISHIMOTO et al.

By /Amy E. Schmid/
2009.10.08 10:43:01 -04'00'

Amy E. Schmid
Registration No. 55,965
Attorney for Applicants

AES/emj
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
October 8, 2009

Enclosures:

- (1) PTO/SB/08 Form
- (2) Terminal Disclaimer